

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
October 21, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on October 21, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	CRWG Resource Action Package (dated September 30, 2003)
Attachment 4	CRWG Resource Action Package (dated October 17, 2003)

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

### **Action Items – September 16, 2003 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the September 16, 2003 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #C59:</b>	Distribute Resource Action Identification Forms (RAIFs) to work group for review and comment
<b>Status:</b>	Chris Acken distributed RAIFs to the CRWG.
<b>Action Item #C60:</b>	Evaluate the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) resource action for a cultural center at Riverbend Park and consider merging with similar action in CRWG.
<b>Status:</b>	Chris Acken from DWR compiled a list of 15 items, 10 of which relate to a cultural center. She suggested a cross-resource task force be initiated between the CRWG and the RSWG to discuss the proposed cultural center.
<b>Action Item # C61:</b>	Review Resource Action Identification Forms and be prepared to discuss comments at October CRWG meeting.
<b>Status:</b>	The CRWG participants reviewed and discussed the Resource Action Identification Forms at the meeting (see discussion below).

### **Study Plan Implementation Update**

Janis Offermann, DWR Resource Area Manager, informed the group that the inventory survey has been completed. She distributed maps showing the survey coverage and shared a map displaying the density of known archaeological sites. She said that a map showing sensitivity of these resources is under development. Once again, it was clarified that the inventory boundary or working "Area of Potential Effects" has been established as the FERC project boundary, as shown on the survey coverage map. Several requests to modify and/or clarify maps showing site density relative to common place names or pre-dam conditions were made.

Mark Selverston told the group that the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) is still reviewing the Historical Resources Evaluation Work Plan and they are awaiting feedback. He added that

the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has already provided comments. He mentioned that Art Angle's suggestion to include Maidu monitors on multiple-component sites is being developed and Sonoma State University is working on a mechanism to hire tribal representatives to observe evaluation work on those site types.

One participant asked if any foundations left from historic structures had been discovered. Mark answered that over 100 building-related sites had been found, some with foundations. One participant asked if the survey included Yankee Hill, and Mark responded that the area is outside of the working APE and therefore was not surveyed.

### **Resource Action Discussion**

The Facilitator distributed copies of CRWG Resource Action package(s) to those who had not received them in the mail (Attachments 3 and 4). She explained that the goal of this meeting was to complete discussions of the proposed resource actions and to arrive at a consensus to recommend a set of proposed resource actions to the Plenary Group and to the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) team for analysis.

The CRWG discussed the individual resource actions included in the package, asked questions or sought clarification on a number of RAI Fs, and suggested revisions that were made during the meeting. Discussion topics included clarification on the relationship between CRWG1 and CRWG5--the first proposes moving the boat ramp only, the second would close the area to recreational use. There was also a question about CRWG12 and the location of the historic springs and how restoration would occur. Janis noted that the location of all of these springs cited in CRWG12 was not clear, but that most, if not all, are likely outside the APE. The number of archaeologists/rangers requested in CRWG6, CRWG14, and CRWG15 were clarified. Under the scenarios described in CRWG6 and CRWG14, only one new position would be added, in total. Under CRWG15, the number of new rangers was expected to be two, and it was clarified that the associated agencies would primarily be the BLM and the U.S. Forest Service. Questions and clarifications concerning the RAI Fs for CRWG11, CRWG17, CRWG24, and CRWG26 were also addressed during the meeting. The Oroville Salmon Festival, Feather Fiesta Day, and the Salmon Festival Pow-Wow were added to CRWG27.

The CRWG discussed potential resource actions related to Foreman Creek. The Facilitator explained that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group matrix includes a resource action for increased recreational use at Foreman Creek, while the CRWG would prefer limited access, making this issue an important topic for cross-resource discussions between the two work groups.

One participant asked about plant studies related to the proposed resource action (CRWG24) to provide Native Americans with an opportunity to collect traditional plants for cultural uses. The Facilitator suggested that the Environmental Work Group could provide assistance with this resource action by identifying specific locations where traditional plants could be propagated for the exclusive use of Native Americans. One participant asked if it would be possible to grow elderberry bushes for harvest by the Native Americans even though they provide habitat for an endangered species (the valley elderberry longhorn beetle). The Facilitator agreed to ask the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representative in the Environmental Work Group whether there is a provision within the Endangered Species Act to allow for such collection. Janis Offermann suggested that this is another cross-resource discussion topic. The Facilitator added that the Environmental Work Group is working on a Vegetation Management Plan that could possibly include a traditional plant-harvesting component.

The CRWG discussed the location of a cultural center or complex and the need to identify a location agreeable for all stakeholders. Janis reminded the CRWG that another resource action

has been proposed for a separate curation facility (CRWG26). She asked if the CRWG would be more comfortable re-wording the cultural center resource action to allow for the analysis of several potential locations rather than identifying a specific location for the cultural center. Chris Acken added that a menu approach could be employed in which all of the potential uses and suggested locations could be identified in the resource action identification form for analysis, with several configurations possible. The CRWG agreed to this approach, and Chris offered to revise the form.

Steve Heipel reviewed the CRWG Resource Action worksheet (Attachment 4). He explained that the proposed resource actions have been divided into two lists: (1) proposed actions considered to be protection or mitigation measures intended to address ongoing impacts in the event impacts are identified; and (2) actions that would not be required for protection and mitigation but considered enhancements. He also explained that CRWG21, CRWG22, and CRWG23 were submitted by the three Federally Recognized Tribes under their government-to-government relationship and have been included for information only and would not be discussed in the CRWG. The CRWG added proposed resource actions CRWG29 (related to reconfiguring recreational and protective opportunities at Foreman Creek) and CRWG30 (describing a Native American cultural complex).

The Facilitator described the PDEA analysis process and noted that the PDEA team would analyze all of the actions included on the protection/mitigation list. She suggested that the CRWG could assist in focusing additional efforts by identifying those enhancement actions considered to be a priority by the CRWG. The CRWG identified their priority actions and Chris Acken tallied the results. CRWG30 (a Native American cultural complex) received twice as many indications of priority as any other single resource action. Actions receiving the second largest indication of priority included CRWG7 (public education program) and CRWG16 (develop publications and brochures for cultural awareness education). Janis Offermann explained that if the CRWG is in agreement with the suite of proposed resource actions, both the mitigation/protection list and the prioritized enhancement list would be presented to the Plenary Group at its November meeting and forwarded to the PDEA team to begin their analysis. The CRWG agreed by consensus that the lists are ready for presentation.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

Janis noted that the CRWG has little to do until information is obtained from Study Plan C2 and asked whether the participants were comfortable canceling the November CRWG meeting. The CRWG agreed to cancel the next meeting and DWR agreed to provide a written update in its place. The next CRWG meeting is tentatively scheduled for:

Date: December 9, 2003  
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.  
Location: To be determined

### **Action Items**

The following action items identified by the CRWG include a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item due date.

<b>Action Item #C62:</b>	Ask the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representative in the Environmental Work Group whether there is a provision within the Endangered Species Act to allow for Native American collection of traditional plants that provide habitat for an endangered species.
<b>Responsible:</b>	Facilitator
<b>Due Date:</b>	November 2003

**Action Item #C63:** Revise resource action related to cultural center/complex to allow for the analysis of multiple uses and various location options.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** November 2003

**Action Item #C64:** Present recommended proposed resource actions to Plenary Group and PDEA team for analysis  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 2003

**Action Item #C65:** Distribute a November update to CRWG participants.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** November 2003